The Delusions of Civil Defense, P. 3

How the Holifield Committee Put As Pessimistic A Look As Possible on Test Detection, Pages 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 30 AUGUST 7, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Mr. K's New Communist Manifesto

I wish every reader could read for himself the new draft program of the Soviet Communist Party. The text, filling eight solid pages of newsprint, was published in last Tuesday's *New York Times,* which thereby performed a public service. The day that *Pravda* reprints in full a similar document the Soviet Union will be showing a similar confidence in the ability of its people to evaluate for themselves a critical analysis from the opposing camp. The document needs to be read in full; no summary can transmit its flavor. Propaganda, pro and con, has given a very false picture of it. It has been compared by some newspapers here (even before the text was available) with Hitler's *Mein Kampf*; this is wicked nonsense. On the other hand, Soviet propaganda has presented it as a new and fundamental blueprint for the future, a new Communist Manifesto. It does not live up to this advance billing; Marx and Engels said far more in much less. This is more like a Papal encyclical; the nuances can only be grasped by specialists in the theology involved. It is very long and gets quite turgid. It is disappointingly vague on the future. In many ways its resembles one of our quadrennial party platforms, full of familiar clichés and glowing but safely imprecise promissory notes. Indeed this is best read as a sort of campaign document, on the eve of a new Party Congress, in which Khrushchov while repeating all the standard Marxist-Leninist phrases to keep the orthodox happy, pushes ever so slightly ahead in the direction he has charted. This direction is a good one, toward co-existence abroad and a more relaxed atmosphere at home. This is what has made Khrushchov popular, and distinguishes him from Stalin—who is not mentioned even once in these 50,000 words. How Khrushchov must have hated him to be so ungenerous.

The Horrors of Capitalism

Most of the first half is a rehash of party dogma as served up in almost every official document; the main burden of these pages is how bad things are in the outside world under capitalism. This is at least as badly distorted a view of life on our side as our press and writers tend to give of life on theirs. It plays up everything bad, and soft-pedals everything good. It adds up a lot of half-truths; this operation, by the laws of propaganda's arithmetic, creates a final picture three-quarters false. This is tailored to two needs, one doctrinal, the other practical. The doctrinal one is to make the facts of life fit a picture Marx and Engels drew in 1848. They said that while the serf under feudalism "managed to develop into a bourgeois" the modern laborer "on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth." This has proven strikingly untrue in every modern capitalist State; it is true only of clerical-feudal dictatorships like Franco's Spain or Salazar's Portugal, backwaters untouched by capitalist development.*

Not Through War

"It is not through war with other countries, but by the example of a more perfect organization of society, by rapid progress in developing the productive forces, the creation of all conditions for the happiness and well-being of man, that the ideas of communism will win the minds and hearts of the masses."

—New Draft Program, Soviet Communist Party.

The practical reason for drawing so black a picture of conditions in the outside world is to reconcile the working class and peasantry in the Soviet Union to living standards which, though improving, are still miserably low by comparison with ours. Any Russian who travels abroad will see for himself how little resemblance life in the West bears to this picture of enslavement, mass unemployment, increasing misery, and growing repression. We pick out of this pudding of distortions a sample plum, "Capitalism extensively exploits female and child labor." No one would guess from this the vast strides made in half a century away from such exploitation nor how much more intensively the labor of women is exploited in the Soviet Union than in any Western state. There is not one of them in which old women sweep the streets to make a living as they do in Moscow.

The sharpest caricature in the program is reserved for the "welfare state", the real competitor Sovietism fears:

"The advocates of the bourgeois state call it a 'welfare state'," the draft program says scathingly. . . . "But the masses see from their own experience that the bourgeois state is an obedient tool of the monopolies and that the vaunted 'welfare' is welfare for the magnates of finance capital, but suffering and torture for hundreds of millions of working men."

This is demagogic rubbish; welfare state reforms, won in the face of bitter opposition from finance capital, have eased the lot of the worker in every Western capitalist State; Soviet workers will be lucky if they reach the same level of comfort as ours in the next two decades, as we hope they will. But this kind of deliberate falsity leads straight

(Continued on Page Four)

*** "The bourgeoisie during its rule of scarce one hundred years," Marx and Engels wrote admiringly in the Communist Manifesto, "has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together." That was in 1848. The next 100 years were to show that they hadn't seen anything yet.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Holifield Hearings on Research In Nuclear Test Detection Methods . . .

The hearings held by Chairman Chet Holifield (D. Cal.) of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy into the research work in progress on nuclear test detection techniques were one-sided and slapdash. There was a time when Mr. Holifield was one of the few conscientious and independent men on this key committee. Unfortunately his accession to the chairmanship has completed the process of assimilating him to the Pentagon and AEC point of view. The hearings were calculated to belittle the possibility of an effective system of inspection and so to pressure the Kennedy Administration to resume testing. The tone was set the first day of the hearing by Dr. Richard Latter of the RAND Corporation, whom the Pentagon picked as chairman of Project VELA, which has the task of improving these techniques. His testimony showed the military were not mistaken in their choice.

No Clues?

Dr. Latter treated the most science fiction-like ideas for evading detection as if they were practically achieved while regarding with stringent skepticism any idea, even though already tested in the laboratory, for improving detection. He concluded with a statement so sweeping as to be patently untrue. He said "research has as yet given *no clue*" (our italics) "as to means for improving the Geneva system sufficiently to permit detection and identification of shielded tests in space or decoupled tests underground." Even these hearings, cursory and prefabricated as they were, showed that there were a number of promising clues.

In his prepared statement Dr. Latter disparaged one of them—the possibility of using electromagnetic signals to identify underground explosions (reported in *Aviation Week* of July 17). But Rep. Mel Price (*D. Ill.*)—the only member of the Committee who asked any questions designed to produce more information rather than just disparage detection—elicited a different view from another VELA witness, Dr. Charles C. Bates. Dr. Bates indicated that the electrical signals "were much larger than theory called for" and that there was hope by this means "to find a signal that the more you decouple [i.e. the bigger the hole you hide it in] the bigger the signal." Dr. Bates said "a modest research effort" was underway on this and that there were plans soon to "actually put a very large electrical charge into the earth and see how far we can detect it.'

Dr. Latter said nothing in his prepared statement of the work being done at Bell Laboratories (as disclosed in the current *Journal of the American Acoustical Society*) on transferring seismic data to audio tapes and distinguishing earthquakes from underground explosions by ear, another new idea in this field. When Mr. Price asked Dr. Latter about this, he got an evasive answer. But Dr. Bates was more optimistic and volunteered the information that the University of Michigan, using similar methods, had achieved some strikingly encouraging results.

The crucial weakness of this whole experimental program is that funds and personnel are controlled by the Pentagon,

Geo. Washington and Chiang Kai-shek

The next time the issue of Communist China comes up in Congress we hope there will be one member at least with the nerve to get up and read Washington's advice in his Farewell Address to keep from "inveterate antipathies against particular nations", warning that "the nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred . . . is in some degree a slave." U.S. policy has been enslaved, not so much from antipathy to Red China, as from fear of Chiang Kai-shek's China Lobby. The Senate July 28 unanimously passed a resolution opposing recognition or admission to the UN about which probably two dozen members have serious misgivings. None dared voice them on the floor. Verbose and inflammatory amendments by Dodd which had been defeated 9 to 7 in the privacy of the Foreign Relations Committee were accepted on the floor without opposition. Mao Tse-tung will rank in history as one of the greatest men of our age; Dodd called him "the arch dope peddler of all time." Morse next day, following a corkscrew line of his own, opposed recognition and admission, too, calling China "that international political leper colony" but thought we ought to debate the subject at the UN. Much was said by him of the menace of a nuclear China but nothing of Peking's repeated offers to negotiate an atom free Pacific. Fulbright on ABC TV's Issues and Answers next day called the resolution "a ritual" stemming from the days of McCarthy, doubted whether we would even recognize Outer Mongolia and said "in this field . . . we more or less take our orders" from Chiang Kai-shek.

Pa. Republican Only Voice in Either House to Question Berlin Crisis Arms Buildup

"I think we in Congress are running a pretty high excitement with all these brave calls to arms, but are we not in danger of jumping off the dock, if we do not give the policy ample and serious study? . . . I think the peoples of the world might heave a sigh of relief, and help us make up our policy, and support us when we do.

"We must go slow on this policy because we are at present in an enormous arms race with one of the major powers. . . . Everyone on this floor can rest assured that Russia . . . will not sit still. She will take retaliatory action just like the tariff reactions. We take an action and somebody else takes another action, and pretty soon we get retaliation as the basic method of policy. . . .

"Under Eisenhower I do not believe he immediately jumped and reached for a holster and pistol when he made a broad statement of policy. My recommendation . . . is that we have a little more patience. . . .

"The world must enjoy crises, it manufactures so many, so often. This may not make for serene living but it certainly keeps up the interest. The history of our present day will be written in two words, 'blank' and 'emergency' and you just fill in the blank to suit the particular emergency. . . . If summit meetings lead so promptly to this current situation, let us try a meeting of ordinary people. . . .

"I still remember when the Korean war came along. . . . I asked, 'What are we getting into? Is this really a war?' I was assured by all sides, 'Oh, no; we just have a police action . . . we will get through with this in a hurry.' . . . What are we getting into by our action in Congress today?"

—Fulton (R. Pa.) in the House July 31, the only member to question the wisdom of the bill authorizing the President to call up 250,000 reservists. Three days earlier the Senate unanimously passed this bill and another authorizing $3 and a half billion dollars more for the armed forces.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Designed to Create Pessimistic Headlines and Pressure for Testing

which wants to resume testing and is not at all anxious to prove detection feasible. The Joint Committee is supposed to be a watchdog; a vigorous committee would have explored all these possibilities and called in witnesses from the private laboratories working on these new clues to detection.

Holifield's Vague Invitation

Mr. Price and the committee's executive director, James T. Ramey, tried to explore the subject in depth but the rest of the Committee was uninterested in anything but evidence to support its pro-testing preconceptions. Dr. Latter admitted that the subject "involves a great number of conjectural matters," that he was a pessimist and that "you will find scientists who are perhaps more optimistic" but the Committee made no effort to find them. Holifield stated that "if there is any body of opinion that is founded on reputable scientists that needs to be expressed before this committee we would like to have it." This vague invitation, of which few scientists will be aware until they see the printed record months from now, serves only to give the Chairman an excuse later to say, "Well, we invited opposing points of view to express themselves. . . ."

Even among the witnesses employed by Project VELA, however, it was apparent that there were sharp differences which a vigilant committee would have developed. There was testimony which cast doubt on Dr. Latter's easy calculations about "big holes" and his facile Buck Rogers theories about putting lead shields around atomic explosions millions of miles out in space. One witness, for example, pointed out that such shielding, even if possible, would shut off only x-rays but not three other methods of detecting shots in space: magnetic effects, direct radio frequency signals and direct optical signals. There were also interesting glimpses in the testimony of other methods for improving detection in outer space and underground: a radio frequency pulse signal which would only be improved by attempts at shielding; the discovery that after shocks can be used to distinguish explosions and earthquakes; the still to be fully explored possibilities of large arrays of seismic detectors and of detectors in deep wells. All these were hastily passed over by the committee, as if fearful it might accidentally stumble on grounds for hope.

Far-Sighted Legislators

Although disarmament at the moment looks further away than ever, our far-sighted legislators are already thinking ahead to what we do when we get a disarmament agreement—and it breaks down. This prescience appeared in the debate over the proposed dual purpose Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor which could produce power as well as plutonium. Its Democratic proponents (Holifield in the House; Pastore and Jackson in the Senate; all three hostile to disarmament) argued (in the words of Jackson) "Now imagine that the Communist rule decided to break such an arms agreement? If they did a dual-purpose NPR could easily, cheaply and quickly be put back to work producing plutonium for weapons." The Republicans, fearful as ever of public power, prefer to build a plant which could make only plutonium. They lost the fight in the Senate but won it in the House and the matter is now in conference.

On the Eve of New Holifield Hearings, The Case Against Civil Defense

Too late for coverage in this issue, the Holifield subcommittee of House Government Operations was opening hearings on civil defense as we went to press. The advance list of witnesses indicated that this was to be another stacked performance. As antidote we give here the gist of a statement made by the Eugene, Oregon, Peace Information Center before the Oregon State Legislature on the State Civil Defense Budget last Feb. 8:

"Studies carried out by Hugh Everett III and George E. Pugh for the Institute for Defense Analysis and presented as testimony [actually it appears only in the Appendix—IFS] before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy in June of 1959, show clearly how meaningless current civil defense efforts are.

"Let us first look at the limitations in their figures. They have assumed that the weapons delivery error would be 100 miles. They have only considered deaths due to fallout and occurring up to 60 days after the attack. Nevertheless, in the graph which represents an attack proportional to population density, the total casualties in the untrained population with emergency instructions to remain under shelter after attack range from 60% in an attack with 2,000 megatons to 98% in an attack with 20,000 megatons. The total casualties in a trained population with six months in which to build shelters range from 38% to 89% for the same yield of weapons.

"Hanson Baldwin, military affairs editor for the New York Times, indicates 'studies show that if about 30% of the population of any country is killed, wounded or put out of action, that country will no longer function as a rational and coherent social organization.' Let us emphasize that in the smallest all-out conflict of thermonuclear weapons referred to above, even with a well-trained and sheltered civilian population, 38% of our nation (68,000,000 Americans) would become casualties from fallout alone, within 60 days—enough to render our society inoperable. . . . More effective programs could be considered. A civil defense program that could possibly protect a majority of our population against present weapons would involve permanent underground bomb shelters for our population, for manufacturing facilities, for water supplies, for food . . . it would involve permanently living underground since ballistic missile systems, when in full operation, will only provide about 15 minutes warning of attack. . . .

"Even if we were willing to accept such a grotesque way of life, we would nevertheless urge the rejection of civil defense programs of any magnitude because . . .

"We believe that civil defense is in itself an aggressive act. . . . Gen. Carl Spaatz, retired Air Force Chief of Staff . . . says: 'It will be particularly important for us to know from now on whether the Soviet Union is building civilian shelters for its own people. This can be one of the most significant indicators of its intentions, if and when it gets ready to launch a surprise attack.' If we are to assume that civil defense preparations in Russia are an indication of hostile intent, how do we expect Russia to view such preparations on our part?

"Second, we believe that civil defense negotiations will make us tend to rely on war rather than negotiation. . . . The false sense of security derived from civil defense will tend to make us 'quicker on the trigger'. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Danger Point Lies in the Awakening Colonial World

(Continued from Page One)

to the most dangerous self-delusions in the draft program, "The world capitalist system as a whole is ripe for the social revolution of the proletariat." Why, then, are the Communist parties losing ground in every Western country, even in Italy, the most backward? To say that world capitalism is ripe for revolution is to risk being doped by one's own opium. A revolutionary situation has a fairly precise meaning in the Marxist-Leninist lexicon; this is certainly not it. To say so is to create an unreal world, as unreal as our picture of the Soviet Union as a slave state.

One Lovely Sentence

But we must in all empathy give Khrushchov the same allowance we do Kennedy; political leadership must find common denominators for action, and these are necessarily low and involve the soothing repetition of the familiar. One paragraph and one sentence ring out eloquently from this morass of dull verbiage; the first, disavowing war but setting example as the road to world communism, we quote in the box on page one. The other is this, and it speaks more truly perhaps than the drafters themselves realized: "A mighty unifying thunderstorm marking the springtime of mankind is raging over the earth." This is beautiful and hopeful. The truth is that if peace can be preserved we shall move into an era when the two systems will become more unifyingly alike. This draft program promises much in the future which the welfare state has already given workers in the West. On the other hand capitalism has been much modified from what it was in 1848; Marx and Engels, in espousing the progressive income tax then, would never have dared believe that capitalist states would ever tax capitalists at the high rates to which they have grown accustomed. The past 100 years have been marked by the steady erosion of property rights everywhere, the steady increase in the power of the State over the economy, the successful insistence of the poor everywhere that the rich be taxed for their benefit. Socialization advances on seven league boots under every form of society. In this perspective the human family can grow together.

To this end, Khrushchov is making his contribution. Along with the stale shibboleths in this draft program are fresh departures: on the possibility of using democratic means "even before capitalism is overthrown (to) compel the bourgeoisie to carry out measures that transcend ordinary reforms"; on achieving socialism peacefully by "paying off" the property owners; by appealing for the widest kind of front for peace including "that section of the bourgeoisie" which sees that thermonuclear war "would not spare the ruling classes of capitalist society either" (though still a little vague on the fact that neither would it spare communist leadership). Mr. K cannot bring himself to say openly that given peace the West will become more socialized and the Communist East more liberalized, but this is his direction and this way lies peace.

The danger lies in the colonial world. While the Soviet Union lines up in favoring "wars of liberation" by the colonial peoples, we are beginning dangerously to emphasize the supply of arms to shaky colonial regimes against "subversion." That way lies our appearance on the side of the counter-revolution. This would be fatal to us and to peace. The wise course is cooperation between East and West in colonial development on a planned basis through international organizations. Communist experts and big business men already find themselves working side by side in developing such areas as Guinea. All the new countries want aid from both sides. To regularize this, to substitute friendly cooperation for hostile competition, is a first necessity for peaceful relations and human survival.

Still the Heavy Hand

In civil liberty and the arts, the new draft program offers little. It says nothing at all about greater legal guarantees of the person against the police. In discussing freedom of speech and press it departs in no way from the Stalin period insistence that black is white. The party bureaucracy dare not admit that these rights are still real in the West and exist only on paper in the East. As for the arts, the draft program clings to "socialist realism." Socialist realism is Sinclair Lewis's George F. Babbitt's idea of "wholesome," "constructive" and "real" art. The bureaucracy's ideal in this respect is the same Philistine ideal as that of the bourgeoisie. Both share the same distaste for modern art and for critical literature and are wholly unable to understand the creative agonies.

We Cannot Send Samples to Friends Unless You Send Long Addressed Stamped Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15. D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

8/7/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED